University of Alberta

Biographia Literaria: Coleridge's Critique of Print Culture

by

Barbara Gail Langhorst

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

Department of English

Edmonton, Alberta

Fall 1996

National Library of Canada

Acquisitions and Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-612-18164-2

Canada

University of Alberta

Library Release Form

Name of Author: Barbara Gail Langhorst

Title of Thesis: Biographia Literaria:
Coleridge's Critique of Print Culture

Degree: Master of Arts

Year this Degree Granted: 1996

Permission is hereby granted to the University of Alberta Library to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly, or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves all other publication and other rights in association with the copyright in the thesis, and except as hereinbefore provided, neither the thesis nor any substantial portion thereof may be printed or otherwise reproduced in any material form whatever without the author's prior written permission.

Barbara G. Langhorst

3211 - 47th Street
Edmonton, Alberta, Canada
T6L 4R9

25 September 1996

University of Alberta

Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis entitled "Biographia Literaria: Coleridge's Critique of Print Culture" submitted by Barbara Gail Langhorst in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

Professor J. Mulvihill

Professor D. Miall

Professor D. Bruce

23 Sept 1996

Abstract

S. T. Coleridge's Biographia Literaria identifies crucial gaps in twentieth-century theories by Habermas and Klancher that consider the periodical as agent of socio/cultural development yet fail to recognize the impact of literary repressions generated by the reviews. Periodical mediation essentially determined both the reception of texts and the economic survival of their writers; furthermore, journals cultivated the public's taste for literary personalities, challenging boundaries between public and private. While like writers such as De Quincey, Hazlitt, and Lamb, Coleridge capitalizes on the appeal of the apologia, he also aims, as does Wordsworth, at critical, poetic, and cultural reform. Coleridge not only presents his personal efforts to negotiate the writer/intellectual's shifting economic position and authority-base in contemporary discourse, but also critiques print culture's influence on the definition and dissemination of "literature" and "culture." Today, during the current revolution in information technology, Coleridge's critical thought is particularly provocative.

Acknowledgement

I would like to thank Dr. J. Mulvihill for his guidance in both the topic formulation and research for this thesis.

Table of Contents

Introduction 1

Chapter 1
Intent and Method: Apologia and Manifesto 13

I. Apologia: Fragmentation, Self-Representation, and the Public 14

II. Reform Manifesto: Authority, Taste, and Readership 25

Chapter 2
Production and the Man of Letters 38

I. The Man of Letters 38

II. Patrons, Public, and Commerce 40

III. Coleridge at Trade: Private and Public Journals 43

IV. The Biographia: Ideology and Production 53

V. Repressions and Self-Representation 55

Chapter 3
Publication and Periodical Reception 58

I. The Biographia's Extension: Response to the Reviews 59

II. The Biographia's Initial Critique 65

III. 1813-17: Reception, Publicity, Autobiography 71

Conclusion 78

Table of Contents (Continued)

Notes 82

Works Cited 83

Introduction

Of the many complexities and contradictions faced by the Romantic author, surely the escalating influence of new forms of the "public" and its resulting interpenetration of the "private" realm generated the most severe impact. The age saw the transformation of the periodical. Originally a discursive forum that assembled a "public" from writers and private readers, the periodical evolved into an institutionalized body that literally produced public opinion. Socially and economically, the appetite of the expanding middle class consumed forms of textuality that effaced traditional boundaries between public and private and created a market for "personality." Although, obviously, financial opportunities for writers were amplified by the diversification of venues and roles, in fact circumstances limited possibilities for authors not endorsed by the reviews. Samuel Taylor Coleridge's attempt to negotiate this flux of private and public is captured in his Biographia Literaria; his representation of self and theory provides a very personal testimonial to the socio/economics of the Romantic period's "literary life." By discussing paradigms connecting writing with cultural development and by exploring the link between print, public, and private, this introduction will contextualize my

study of Coleridge's conceptual and material struggle for reception of the Biographia.

Fundamental to Jürgen Habermas's text, The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere, is his notion that in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, "private people, come together to form a public, readied themselves to compel public authority to legitimate itself before public opinion" (25-6). Habermas locates the origins of this phenomenon in seventeenth-century German "table societies" and "literary societies," the British coffeehouses in their "golden age" (1680-1730), and the eighteenth-century French salons (32-4). All microcosms of democracy, these sites offered critical debates that engaged members of the educated middle-class and nobility alike, thus blurring social boundaries, temporarily erasing the bonds of patronage, and freeing "opinion" from economics (32-3). Habermas holds that such environments habituated participants to social "parity" (32); the initial critiques of art (including literature) facilitated later political discussion and thereby the "private sphere in the world of letters" effectually generated the "public sphere in the political realm" (30). Habermas theorizes an expansion of this debate process into a form of ultimately consensual "public opinion" through which the public "put the state in touch with the needs of society" (31).

He reads the significance of art in forming cultural discourse in the rise of both the critic and the periodical. The commodification of art in the eighteenth century was culturally liberating in that ownership required private individuals to interpret works and articulate opinions in a discourse of criticism freed from the prescriptions of Church and aristocracy (36-7). Habermas stresses that even groups coalesced in a "publicist" function to represent the bourgeois were conscious of membership in a fluid and comprehensive larger formation (37). Opportunities for individuals to supplant existing expert opinion in the exercise of private analytical and persuasive powers eventually gave rise to the "public spokesman"--the "Kunstrichter (art critic)" whose authority, Habermas claims, resided in his arguments rather than in his status (41). The task of disseminating the art critic's views to the public, now grown past the "salons, coffeehouses, and societies," was assumed by the journal (41). By the middle of the eighteenth century, periodicals designed as vehicles of "institutionalized art criticism" fostered the objectification of "art" (art/literature/philosophy) as a means to a critical end; critical practice shifted the focus so completely that art existed only in connection with its criticism (41-2). Although these journals modelled critical thought and transformed the public's relation to art, they became equally removed from both the objects of their criticism and their discursive public environments. Habermas identifies

another type of periodical, the "moral weekly" (which pre-dated the critical journal), as not only generative of coffee-house debates but also of extensions to the parameters of these discussions by linking the public through its publication of its readers' letters (42). The moral weeklies included art, literature, and criticism, and, in indulging the bourgeois taste, presented the public with "a mirror" in which to observe itself--while also offering editorial commentary directed toward social change (43).

Habermas claims that developments in the press trace the change in the meaning of the term "publicity" (181) from the representation of (private views formed into) critical public opinion to that manipulative form "generated from above...in order to create an aura of good will for certain positions" (177). Transformed from an enterprise that assembled and disseminated "pure news" to one that was politically implicated through its editorial reproduction of ideologies and interpretations, the newspaper acquired the ability to form public opinion (182). Habermas follows the transition through the journals, generally operated by men of letters (at a loss), that took on editors in "publicist" functions distinct from the commercial role played by publishers (183). In this dislocation of interest from economics, Habermas perceives that at the "turn of the nineteenth century," the press, through its participation in discourse, "remained thoroughly an institution of this very public" (183). He links the

shift from this role as public instrument with the success of its bourgeois political aims, asserting that in the 1830s the press changed, orienting itself instead to profit (184).

Despite (or perhaps because of) its impressive scope, Habermas's paradigm differs in crucial ways from the experience of public and private realms represented by Coleridge. Habermas's model of a singular "public sphere" arrived at through the critical debate of individuals is reductive and notional; although vigorous discussion could well produce a dominant discourse, it is inadequate to unite the contradictory agendas of private persons with competing economic, social, and personal motivations. Conversely, the Biographia's less schematic strategy portrays diversity and fragmentation. To be sure, Coleridge also reifies a monolithic "public," but he conceptualizes it as one portion of society. "The PUBLIC," for Coleridge, is an insatiable, poorly-educated, uncritical consumer produced by print culture, rather than as (in Habermas's model) an autonomous democratic debate. Outside "the PUBLIC," Coleridge addresses a variety of groups and individuals, and although his stratification by occupation and degree of education reflects his ideology,[1] it does recognize the conflicting aims of, for instance, members of the press, "respectable" businessmen, the clergy, authors, and intellectuals. (Habermas defines the "private people" of the public sphere as "educated" but does not in

any sense differentiate between levels [37].) Habermas's view of the press prior to 1830 as the economically-disinterested, privately-subsidized vehicle of public opinion contrasts vividly with the Biographia's 1815-7 insistence that contemporary periodicals are designed to create sensation, opinion, and thus sales. Derek Roper's excellent study supports the assertion that reviews were indeed lucrative endeavors, even as early as Griffith's Monthly Review in 1749 (20); contradicting Habermas, he remarks that "a popular Review was itself a highly profitable enterprise" (32).

Although Habermas's investment in the subordination of the press to the political aims of the evolving public sphere permits him to view the literary function of the periodical in terms of its contribution to the enlightenment of the middle class, he fails to perceive the variety of complex power formations generated in the circulation and dissemination of the textual information. Jon Klancher's text, The Making of English Reading Audiences, provides a model of development focused specifically upon the interaction of society and writing; in his analysis of the development of the periodical industry from the mid-eighteenth to mid-nineteenth century, Klancher examines not only textual democracy and social hierarchy but also audience configuration and authority. While Klancher agrees with Habermas that the journal originated as a project of the Enlightenment in which the participation of readers as writers in eighteenth-

century journals mimicked egalitarian debate, Klancher asserts that it transformed the "public sphere" into a mere "representation"--a portable object for consumption (24). He argues that rather than forming a continuous discourse, each of a multiplicity of periodicals formed discrete communities of readers by "subdividing [and colonizing] the larger public" (20, 25). The notion of a universal readership was an ideological goal, unattainable for the eighteenth-century journal; the English "public sphere" existed only in a "qualified...sense" as a continuum of broadening, interlocking "concentric circles" of periodical audiences based on social categories (26). After 1790, Klancher speculates, class insecurity generated by the French Revolution disrupted this order and audiences no longer could be simply recruited--they must be created through "politically and socially defined" habituation (36). As Klancher points out, particularly following the disastrous loss of subscriptions to his journal, The Watchman, Coleridge was poignantly aware of the need to "produce" an audience through its reading habits (38).

The analysis of the rising power of ideology in nineteenth-century periodicals is particularly significant in a study of Coleridge. Newly homogeneous representation precluded the previous exchange with readers in the "letter-to-the-editor" (although it was at times simulated); power subtly shifted the possibility for self-publishing middle-class journals to institutions

that aligned the text of professional writers to specific corporate views and politics. Although Habermas maintains that at this time the press's admittedly ideological editorials contributed (without financial profit) to public opinion through democratic debate, Klancher portrays a far more economically-interested, power-oriented operation within which collaboration (of writer/editor/publisher) writers are identifiable by style rather than content (51). The Biographia's critique of reviewing practices and "anonymous critics" substantiates this, noting that just as the periodical writer's agency is absorbed by corporate strategy, so is his personal sense of responsibility. While early nineteenth-century public opinion, then, is not (as Habermas contends) a function of rational argument by private individuals, Klancher asserts that it derives from the practice of reading itself; "moving between alternative vocabularies of social and intellectual order," the middle class "learns to operate those interpretive strategies through which it can 'read' a social world,...a textual field, and to discover its own purpose within them" (51). Aware of his own marginalized position in this discourse, Coleridge questions the value of the social "purpose" that readers can derive from periodical criticism.

The relationship between the review, other forms of text, and private/public relations is one that neither Klancher nor Habermas consider. To be sure, in his introduction to "Romanticism and Its Publics: A Forum,"

Klancher does identify Habermas's omission of the period from 1790 to 1830 as a crucial theoretical gap in the sense (among others) that it does not capture the transition from the eighteenth-century understanding of "literature" to that of the nineteenth century (524). On the other hand, in The Making of English Reading Audiences, Klancher himself specifically asserts that "the ruthless criticism of poets" was not among "what was most culturally profound about the journals' role in public discourse" (50). If, as he contends, however, "no discourse was so immediately identified with power in the nineteenth century as...the Edinburgh Review and the Quarterly Review" (69), undoubtably the ideology of "criticism" produced by these periodicals is implicated in the definition of "literature" and ultimately, in culture itself. Roper writes of the "opportunities wasted" for:

> Six or seven great writers--foremost among them Wordsworth, Coleridge, Keats, and Jane Austen--[who] came before critics who had the attention of a larger public than critics had ever known and practically unlimited space in which to develop their ideas. The Edinburgh ridiculed Wordsworth and Coleridge for at least twenty years; the Quarterly, politically more sympathetic, did not begin counter-operations until 1814 and soon gave them up. (46)

Kathleen Wheeler asserts that, in fact, "the effects of the first reviews on the Biographia continued to plague its sales. The first edition never sold out during Coleridge's lifetime" (161). Furthermore, as Marilyn Butler suggests, "probably [the Edinburgh's editor] Jeffrey helped to browbeat the isolated rural Wordsworth and the insecure urban Coleridge and Lamb out of the populism they were associated with in the 1790's" ("Culture's medium" 138).

Obviously, public acculturation to periodical ideology changes taste and literary reviews influence reception; while eighteenth-century reviewing had literature as its object, however, the significance of the institutionally-empowered slashing of the nineteenth-century lies in that it targeted authors through their texts. Certainly this was the case for Coleridge; Wheeler describes the "rambling and unfocused personal attacks" that characterized the response to the Biographia (160). Subordinating argument to opinion, this form of publicity effectually authored a craving for "personality." The public taste for private lives in place of cultural texts drew writers to secure publication through forms of autobiography as both self-defense and social comment. Coleridge's insistence that reviewing be structured on principles and argument is, in this environment, as idealistic as Habermas's contention that it was. Certainly it was not a popular concern. The "ruthless criticism of poets," then, was indeed significant in that it fed the public appetite for "personality," disempowered

efforts by writers such as Coleridge and Wordsworth to reform middle-class taste and values, and effectually transformed the course of writing, literature, and society itself.

Their focus on the periodical as the primary instrument of social reform leads both Habermas and Klancher to ignore the interventions of writers from literary positions. My study of Biographia Literaria targets precisely the ways in which Coleridge negotiates contemporary discourse to model his philosophies of language, critical thought, and imagination. Chapter 1 examines the Biographia's intention and method: to justify the fragmentation of his experience and to reveal the unifying power of his theory, Coleridge addresses both popular and intellectual readerships. My strategy is to contextualize the Biographia as both personal apologia and public reform manifesto; this permits me to identify the socio/literary issues underlying the two forms and to demonstrate the connections that synthesize a whole spanning both audiences. The circumstances that generated Coleridge's extreme sensitivity to the question of audience are detailed in Chapter 2, which focuses on production; here I account for the historical, economic, and social forces that both derive from and produce Coleridge's concept of the man of letters--and thereby his "Literary Life." Chapter 3 reflects on the dynamics of reception. This chapter provides documentation and analysis of the periodical reviews of

several of Coleridge's texts; I consider the Biographia in terms of its incisive response to the "critical" practice and discourse that, by defining literature and supplanting truly critical thought, threaten both private and public interests.

While the Biographia is counted among seminal works of literary criticism, its greatest cultural value lies in its peculiar intersection of personal with social concerns. Although Habermas's paradigm and Klancher's model assist us in conceptualizing and historicizing early nineteenth-century print culture, the Biographia identifies gaps between theory and experience and enters areas unexplored by these representations. Coleridge challenges his audience to read even ostensibly personal texts critically, to detect power relations and ideology (including the reader's and his own) in a variety of locations, and to trace the formation of a society through its reception of "literature."

Chapter 1

Intent and Method: Apologia and Manifesto

Biographia Literaria clearly exhibits the "Romantic" fusion of fragmentation with the desire for wholeness and unity. It is unique, however, in that it copes with this contradiction through an intriguing alliance of ostensibly disparate forms: the Biographia stands as both personal apologia and public reform manifesto. Reading the Biographia within these separate contexts reveals that the union is surprisingly apt. Underlying the two forms are related concerns for fragmentation and authority, representation and taste, and, ultimately, for reception. Texts such as the Elia essays by Charles Lamb and his Confessions of a Drunkard, Thomas De Quincey's Confessions of an English Opium-Eater and its sequel, Suspiria de Profundis, and William Hazlitt's Liber Amoris all share the Biographia's strategy of the self-conscious portrayal of a fragmented identity to a reading public. On the other hand, the Biographia's poetical, philosophical and social theory relates to William Wordsworth's "Prefaces" and the "Essay Supplementary," and indeed to Coleridge's own Lay Sermons. Through his combination of these approaches, Coleridge intends simultaneously to display the limitations that his circumstances and character impose on his work and to unify his chaotic experiences through the production of his theories.

I. Apologia: Fragmentation, Self-Representation, and the Public

The "prevailing sense of incompleteness, fragmentation, and ruin" (11) that Thomas McFarland ascribes to the Romantic period is absolutely foundational in its confessional works. The invitation of the public to witness--and, through circulation, to authorize the textual representation of--private humiliation and the dissipation of talent creates, of itself, a fracture in social relations. Although no doubt Rousseau's Confessions model this form, the proliferation of self-revelatory texts in the Romantic period derives largely from the forces that left the private lives of literary figures public in a way previously unexperienced. As Marilyn Butler notes, the publication of satirical attacks on figures such as Coleridge and Lamb generated "compulsive self-portrayals, apologetic or defiant, of almost every significant literary figure of the period" ("Culture's medium" 130). These portraits were informed by changes in the literary environment, some deriving a type of capital from the manipulation of the "ruined" identity. In each case, these confessional texts attempt to resolve the personal alienation of the Romantic author through the controlled public depiction of experiences both feared and embraced--namely, fragmentation and ruin.

De Quincey's Confessions of an English Opium-Eater and Suspiria de Profundis, Hazlitt's Liber Amoris, and Lamb's Confessions of a Drunkard are all portraits of the life fragmented by obsession and addiction; in each, the author attempts to establish meaning and wholeness through unification with an audience. In Liber Amoris, the textual representation of Hazlitt's shattered self-respect is reflected in the fragmentation of the format. The text is composed of one part segmented dramatic dialogues, letters, asides, a book entry and an excerpt of poetry, followed by a section of correspondence (interrupted by a few reflections on love and an apostrophe to Edinburgh), and concludes with a final series of letters to a single recipient. That the letters both repeat information and explicate previous circumstances adds to the piecemeal effect; furthermore, both dialogue and letter form facilitate the reduction of names to simple initials--thus reducing identity to mysterious and ambiguous shards. The other works present less fragmentation in form; Lamb's Confessions of a Drunkard is, by its very brevity, a fragment in itself, while in the Confessions of an English Opium-Eater, De Quincey self-consciously proclaims that:

> I give the notes disjointed as I find them, or have now drawn them up from memory...Whenever it could answer my purpose to transplant them from the natural or chronological order, I have not

> scrupled to do so. Sometimes I speak in the present, sometimes in the past tense...Much has been omitted. (62)

Such violation of narrative principles is accentuated by the Confessions' "sequel," Suspiria de Profundis. In this later work, described by its author as "a caduceus wreathed about with meandering ornaments," digression is the method: "the case is reported...because these facts move through a wilderness of natural thoughts or feelings" (93). Although the "sequel" fails to provide much narrative continuity to De Quincey's Confessions, merely by its alterity it does offer another layer of insight into the author's history and conceptions, thereby suggesting both the incompleteness of the present autobiographical record and the existence of a larger whole as yet undisplayed.

While Hazlitt, Lamb, and De Quincey directly depict personal fragmentation, the Biographia evokes the condition of its author by reflecting on his career, his theories, and his times. For instance, the opium addiction that Coleridge shared with De Quincey is not thematized; instead, Coleridge oscillates between self-mocking reminiscence of his failed enterprises, self-congratulation for his inspirations and his principles, alternating contempt and cajolery of his readers, and general castigation of contemporary critics. Throughout, the Biographia demonstrates the very intellectual diversity that permits Coleridge to theorize unity. Textual leaps negotiate a veritable thematic

catalogue of his concerns (in a manner that is difficult to construe as either narrative or argument), yet Coleridge's self-proclaimed "immethodical... miscellany" (BL I: 88) is strangely authoritative in its depiction of the alienated writer and his situation. Forest Pyle, for instance, interrogates "the performance of Chapter Thirteen--its interruptions, withdrawals, and postponements" and concludes that fragmentation of both text and theory are necessary to Coleridge's self-representation (42). The "desire for identity, for knowledge, for the 'organic whole'...beset and even propelled by images of deformity, mutilation, and ruin" (42), Pyle implies, are inherent to the Biographia's Romantic experience. Similarly, Jerome Christensen perceives in the Biographia a peculiar type of unity that fuses the expression of identity with fragmentation: he reads the text as "a digression that attempts to excuse digressions by charming, impressing, or even confusing," claiming that this performance is designed to reveal "the man beneath the letters" ("Literary Life" 164).

The man beneath Elia and The Last Essays of Elia is a mystery indeed; Lamb's play with fragmented semi-fictional autobiography leaves the reader perhaps a more intense sense of the author as producer than as man. These "confessional" texts obviously relate more closely to Coleridge's anecdotes than to De Quincey's or Hazlitt's compulsive admissions. Unlike Coleridge (who

may at times exaggerate, nothing more), Lamb's manoeuvres in the Elia essays mix self-representation with imagination and weave aspects of both humour and social critique into a startling breadth of topic. The air of disjunction created by his presentation of discrete fragments is accentuated by the republication of the Elia journal articles in single text. His non-periodical text, The Last Essays of Elia (published as an eclectic collection), indicates his preference for the freedom of brief miscellaneous ruminations--or is perhaps an attempt to simulate the journal experience. Simulations and doublings abound in the Elia essays; authorial identity is screened, as when Elia remarks on the "magnificent eulogy" on Christ's Hospital found in "Mr. Lamb's 'Works'" (14), or writes of "making himself many, or reducing many unto himself (Last Essays 171).

Manipulation of the autobiographical referent raises questions about the stability of identity and of the possibilities and motivations for text to convey "true" personality. The fragmentation of Hazlitt's Liber Amoris, for instance, presents the unified desire of a man driven by obsession--yet who paradoxically breaks off the comment, "Her hatred of me must be great, since my love of her could not overcome it!" to self-possessedly advise, "I have finished the book of my conversations with her...if I am not mistaken, you will think it very nice reading" (119). This textual self-reflexivity recalls the reader to the fact that this is a production that generates a particular type of social capital through its

engagement of its audience. Hazlitt's self-revelation becomes simultaneously self-criticism and bald-faced bravado in the context of its reader's mores, and, through this movement, extends a critique of class and gender relations. In a far more overt manner, Lamb's Confessions of a Drunkard offers social intervention as the object of its existence (which oscillates nicely with the immorality of his revelations): "I commend them to the reader's attention, if he finds his own case any way touched. I have told him what I am come to. Let him stop in time" (320). His assertion that he is "a poor nameless egotist" (319) modifies the personal (egotistical autobiographer) with the universal (nameless potential drunkard), thus identifying the speaker as part of a larger whole. Certainly the confession's self-recriminations offer the opportunity for advantageous self-positionings. For instance, De Quincey justifies his Confessions of an English Opium-Eater on the grounds that:

> It will prove, not merely an interesting record, but, in a considerable degree, useful and instructive...that must be my apology for breaking through that delicate and honourable reserve, which, for the most part, restrains us from the public exposure of our own errors and infirmities. (1)

By citing specifically classed expectations and codes of conduct and by using the collective "us" and "our," De Quincey simultaneously portrays himself as a

gentleman (at one with an appropriate audience), offers the necessary apology, and identifies himself as an instructor. The autobiographical genre further permits him to lay claim to specific attributes that, ostensibly due to his addiction, are unsupported by his writing; De Quincey repeatedly refers to himself not only as a "philosopher" but also pronounces that "my proper vocation, as I well knew, was the exercise of the analytic understanding" (64). He asserts not only the talent, but also the accomplishment: "Without breach of truth or modesty, I may affirm, that my life has been, on the whole, the life of a philosopher" (2).

De Quincey aims to justify his life to his audience through his assertions; Coleridge's apologia differs in that it not only defines his abilities but performs and contextualizes them. Coleridge's description of the "process" and "result" of philosophy models both his intent for the Biographia and the Romantic vision of life itself. "In order to obtain adequate notions of any truth," Coleridge insists, "we must intellectually separate its distinguishable parts...But having so done, we must then restore them in our conceptions to the unity" (BL II: 11). This notion contains the germ of the strategy that unites apologia and manifesto in the Biographia; Coleridge's attempted textual synthesis of the "parts" of his fragmented life, its opinions, and its applications casts him as philosopher just as his theory of the imagination and his concepts of poetical and social reform

do. The construction of the philosopher-critic would ideally validate both life and work, creating unity within the text and with its audience. Engell and Bate describe Coleridge's theory as holding that "art that reconciled the productive self with the nature it experienced...opened up the 'organs of spirit'" and recognize "the Biographia [as] partially a defence of the conduct and opinions such a life produced" (BL I: lxxix). Indeed, Coleridge admits the nature of the text as apologia by introducing the notion of "exculpation" (I: 5) almost immediately upon opening, but claims to subordinate the autobiographical, stating that he uses "the narration chiefly for the purpose of giving a continuity to the work." Given that Coleridge's self-representation is clearly focused upon his position as a writer/intellectual, the relationship of the apologia to the reform manifesto here becomes evident; while the confessional "narrative" does not provide linear "continuity to the work," its fragments combine to present the personal and the social matrix upon which Coleridge forms his theories.

An awareness of its precarious relation to both the reading public and to print runs throughout the confessional work. In Confessions of an English Opium-Eater, De Quincey's remarks concerning "the public (into whose private ear I am confidentially whispering my confessions" [61]) demonstrate how self-revelatory texts ironically capitalize upon a type of privacy offered to individual readers within the collective social body. The individual act of reading easily

counterfeits an aura of exclusivity and privacy well-suited to notions of privileged information. That these writers ostensibly deny (but obviously rely upon) the discursively public nature of literature (particularly in print culture) indicates the conspiracy of audience with author to create a pseudo-intimate relationship. For this reason De Quincey, ruminating over the image his readers possess of him, savours "so pleasing a delusion--pleasing both to the public and to me" (61). Hazlitt, however, appears entirely oblivious to his audience--yet the format itself creates a strange shift of personal to public. The titled episodes of dialogue resemble theatre, and thus interpret recollections of intimate emotions and encounters as public display; similarly, the publication of letters recording confidential material challenges orthodox notions of the private. Hazlitt's arrangement of the text into three parts clearly gestures toward publication and readership; Lamb, however, is more explicit, directly addressing these issues and focusing upon audience response and the tension of authority in the private/public dichotomy. In the Confessions of a Drunkard, Lamb pleads, "Trample not on the ruins of a man. Exact not, under so terrible a penalty as infamy, a resuscitation from a state of death almost as real as that from which Lazarus rose not but by a miracle" (313). There is, of course, a certain irony in this self-conscious request; just as "no force can oblige a man to raise the glass to his head against his will" (313), neither can public authority "oblige" a writer

to reveal his private failings. Indeed, Jonathan Bate notes that Lamb's text was published twice--once in 1813 and again (demonstrating a certain literary canniness) subsequent to De Quincey's 1821 Confessions in 1822 (xvii). Nonetheless, in the Elia essay, "Newspapers Thirty-Five Years Ago," Lamb portrays the professional writer as consumed by his public: "The craving Dragon--the Public--like him in Bel's temple--must be fed" (253). The ambiguity, while characteristic of Lamb, is also symptomatic of the complexity of the writer's position.

Coleridge's extreme sensitivity to the issue of readership is patent in Biographia Literaria despite his proclamation that "the original sin of my character consists in a careless indifference to public opinion" (BL I: 44). His attempts to establish control vary from the self-defensive and rather antagonistic declaration that "readers in general take part against the author, in favor of the critic" (I: 30) to the apologetic and implicitly insulting warning that he "shall be obliged to draw more largely on the reader's attention, than so immethodical a miscellany can authorize" (I: 88). At the same time, in a deferential yet relatively confident comment, Coleridge textually creates a readership in tune with both his theory and his digressions: "as I fancied to myself readers who would respect the feelings that had tempted me from the main road; so I dare calculate on not a few, who will warmly sympathize with them" (I: 69). The

distortions of this ideal audience are, however, no secret to Coleridge; aware that those who will never read his text--or who will misread it--are nonetheless interested in his personal defamation, Coleridge gives his critics a little bad press:

> Those at least, let me be permitted to add,
> who have taken so much pains to render me ridiculous for a perversion of taste, and have supported the charge by attributing strange notions to me on no other authority than their own conjectures, owe it to themselves as well as to me not to refuse their attention to my own statement of the theory, which I do acknowledge. (I: 88)

Coleridge's understanding of the negative nature of publicity seems at odds with the confessional aspects of the Biographia, yet, as with De Quincey, Hazlitt, and Lamb, the tantalizing impulse for self-display bears the capital of popular appeal with its promise of circulation. Given the complexity of the text's theory, however, this strategy alone is inadequate; it bespeaks Coleridge's need of a specialized readership to absorb and disseminate not merely the details of his fragmented life but also of his philosophical, critical, and cultural insights.

II. Reform Manifesto: Authority, Taste, and Readership

Coleridge (and, through his influence, Wordsworth) determined that the project of reform demanded theoretical texts designed to facilitate the cultivation of a readership; readers had to be prepared to critically evaluate writings independently of public opinion. The two authors hold competing visions of social and poetical revision, yet, for both, manifestos are a form of self-representation. For instance, although Wordsworth's 1800 "Preface" approaches its readership far differently than his 1815 "Essay Supplementary," the change derives not from shifts in Wordsworth's theory of nature but from his experience of reception. Influenced by his experience of "the PUBLIC," Coleridge shapes the Lay Sermons and the philosophical elements of the Biographia for those whose education equips them to negotiate his provocative style and concepts. The texts of both writers reveal personal investment in their theories; Coleridge, in particular, perceives the disjunctions he records in his "Literary Life" as indicative of the cultural fragmentation produced by the increasingly complex commercial economy. For both Wordsworth and Coleridge, the reform manifesto is an attempt to establish authority and thus to create taste and to carve a readership from a largely unsympathetic public.

Wordsworth's optimistic introduction to this project occurs in his 1800 "Preface" to the second edition of the Lyrical Ballads and is ostensibly a defense

of his poetic works in a theoretical, critical, and moral framework. His aesthetic principles, however, are invested in a far more pervasive ideology--one that anticipates a return, through language, to a simpler, more natural society. While Wordsworth is aware that "the Reader would look coldly upon my arguments, since I might be suspected of having been influenced by the selfish and foolish hope of reasoning him into an approbation of these particular Poems" (120), his subject exceeds the Lyrical Ballads. In a gesture described by Jon Klancher as "breathtaking" (Reading Audiences 139), the "Preface" links poetry to "the present state of the public taste in this country," whether "healthy or depraved," and to "society itself" (120). Wordsworth's hypothesis that relations between society and art are reciprocally influential holds that a revolution in taste will reverse not simply the "fickle tastes and fickle appetites" described in the "Preface" (124) but also the social thought of which they are symptomatic.

It is not difficult to comprehend why, at the time of the writing of the 1800 "Preface," Coleridge believed his principles to coincide with Wordsworth's. As Klancher notes, "the regeneration of taste" (or the cultivation of a literary appreciation for a particular kind of representation) was a project to which both Coleridge and Wordsworth were "deeply committed" (Reading Audiences 151). Both theorized the power of the writer for social reform through a program of aesthetic cultivation. Coleridge's Biographia Literaria

response to Wordsworth's manifesto, however, registers salient disjunctions, particularly concerning language and education. He identifies Wordsworth's "purified" language (1800 "Preface" 124) as the "representation" of the language of "low and rustic life," "raised and qualified by an imperceptible infusion of the author's own knowledge and talent, which infusion does, indeed, constitute it an imitation as distinguished from a mere copy" (BL II: 42-3). In Klancher's words, Coleridge queries "not whether language can represent 'reality' but whether one social language can represent another" (Reading Audiences 141). Coleridge's distinction is critical, for it reveals the idyllic rustic language as a construct not simply of Wordsworth's genius but of his education. The emphasis Coleridge places on this applies to both the language and the characters Wordsworth discusses in his theory. In Wordsworth's paradigm, the rustic life produces healthy emotions and reflectiveness; "Education," Coleridge asserts, "or original sensibility, or both, must pre-exist, if the changes, forms, and incidents of nature are to prove a sufficient stimulant" (BL II: 45). The Coleridgean quality of this contention--that development can only be rooted in education and culture--is revealed by its significance to his cultural essays, the Lay Sermons, published contemporaneously to the Biographia. In all three texts, Coleridge underwrites his authority by the claim to the products of education: time-tested principles, critical thought, extended

experience of literature, philosophy, history, or politics. For Coleridge, then, who reads the "Preface" of 1800 as an assertion that the "real" is "rustic," Wordworth's text is particularly provocative.

The Biographia's analysis of Wordsworth's work offers Coleridge various opportunities to demonstrate the erudition that underwrites his authority. Coleridge's critique of Wordsworth's theory of poetic diction counters its "cultural effects" while, on the other hand, his commentary preserves the literary value of the poetry (Parrinder 88). Jerome Christensen asserts that Coleridge's "own genius...[is marked by] the authority to determine genius and the power to communicate its truth to the world" ("Literary Life" 131). To take this further, Coleridge's performance of the cultivated mind, the educated critic, is designed to attract an appropriate audience and to model the abilities he means to instill; it demonstrates the competence that compensates for, or even arises from, the fragmentation of his life. Coleridge's comment that "I reflect with delight, how little a mere theory, though of his own workmanship, interferes with the processes of genuine imagination in a man of true poetic genius" (BL II: 59-60) is extremely complex; not only does it gently mock both Wordsworth's theory and reluctance to theorize, but it also implicitly subordinates the activity on which his own authority is based (namely, theory) to his own "theory" of the imagination.

That both Coleridge and Wordsworth attempt to derive considerable authority from notions of "imagination," "fancy," and "genius" is hardly coincidence. The Biographia Literaria, begun as Coleridge's Preface and intended as a response to Wordsworth's 1800 "Preface" to the Lyrical Ballads, nonetheless encompasses Coleridge's reaction to the newly-released "Preface to the Edition of 1815" (Engell and Bate xlvi, l). In fact, to render clearly the contemporaneity of the two documents, Coleridge requested that the printer use type identical to that of Wordsworth's latest "Preface" and that his text match its "rival twin" in size (l). Coleridge's object--of reclaiming his intellectual property, and thus reasserting his authority--arises out of Wordsworth's focus on the fancy and the imagination in the new "Preface." Engell and Bate assert that Coleridge "could fairly argue" that were it not for him, Wordsworth "would never have heard of this important 'distinction'" (l). Coleridge's technique for reasserting his critical authority is to extend the exploration of the phenomena, defining Wordsworth's "purpose" as "to consider the influences of fancy and imagination as they are manifested in poetry...while it is my object to investigate the seminal principle" (BL I: 88).

In fact, Wordsworth's exposition of the concept of the imagination is not designed simply to assert ownership of the poetic theory (although certainly he

does find Coleridge's definition of fancy lacking) but to supply the description necessary to authorize his poetry:

> Yet justified by recollection of the insults which the ignorant, the incapable, and the presumptuous have heaped upon these and my other writings, I may be permitted to anticipate the judgment of posterity upon myself, I shall declare...that I have given, in these unfavourable times, evidence of exertions of this faculty [of imagination] upon its worthiest objects. (1815 "Preface" 215)

In this gesture Wordsworth essentially backs away from his position as social theorist and, as Coleridge will agree, asserts that his timeless contribution lies in his poetry. The antipathy of "middle-class readers" and "reviewers [who] objected bitterly to Wordsworth's 'system'...[of] cultural and social determinism" (Klancher, Reading Audiences 137) eventually crushed Wordsworth's optimism for his project. The disparity in tone of his early and later theoretical texts traces Wordsworth's disillusionment and thus demonstrates that the critical document is a vehicle not only of authority but of self-representation. The "Essay Supplementary to the Preface" of 1815, in particular, adopts a defensive position, recollecting both the "degree the poetry of this Island has...been coloured by" the Lyrical Ballads (then published seventeen years earlier), and the "unremitting hostility with which, upon some

principle or other, they have each and all been opposed" (248). Wordsworth's point, rather bitterly asserted, is that the most vocal response, particularly the critical response, is not necessarily congruent with the influence exerted by a body of poetry--and that the strength and diversity of reaction guarantees the work to posterity. Nonetheless, the introductory tirade of the "Essay Supplementary" belies this confidence and sets forth a prescriptive formulation of the innate qualities, experience, and education required of a critic of poetry.

This strategy, essentially a corrective to reading practice (if an ineffectual one), is enacted near the end of the ongoing initiative shared by Wordsworth and Coleridge, namely, the renovation of taste. Wordsworth's reiteration of Coleridge's insight, "that every author, as far as he is great and at the same time original, has had the task of creating the taste by which he is to be enjoyed" ("Essay Supplementary" 249), comes at a point where Wordsworth has had time to reflect upon the social effects that "custom," "the prejudices of false refinement," "pride," "vanity," (249) and (by implication) critical discourse bring to bear upon the reader's taste. Although even the 1800 "Preface" reveals unease, Wordsworth's caution then was simply "that in judging these Poems [the Reader] would decide by his own feelings genuinely, and not by reflection upon what will probably be the judgment of others" (154). In asking the audience to respond as individuals, not discursively, and to act on their feelings,

Wordsworth attempts to separate sympathetic readers from negative social influences and to immerse them in emotion--thus creating taste. His later narrow and programmatic definition of the valuable critic attempts to counter the forces it has proven so difficult to protect readers from. Indeed, the notion of generating or even supporting the development of taste through the rational premises of a theoretical text implicates its author in a kind of intellectualism that is opposed to the poetic principles Wordsworth advocates. The dramatic schism between the rustic language Wordsworth imitates in his poetry and the polished terms in which he normalizes his views to the middle-class reader demonstrates how great is the gap taste must bridge.

Although the confessional elements of the Biographia are designed to be attractive to a middle-class audience, the taste Coleridge intends to develop through the Biographia is located far from popular discourse. His approach differs from Wordsworth's in that the complexity his theory demands is matched by his language; for Coleridge, "language is not the natural expression of man, but the bearer of culture and civilisation...created and sustained by the educated classes of a society" (Parrinder 90). Certainly the attitude to reform proposed by the text reflects this concept; Coleridge seeks to cultivate an audience capable of comprehending his literary and social insights to maintain "culture and civilisation" in the face of capitalism, consumerism, and the expansion of

the press. Coleridge's conviction that taste is best produced by the experience of "the master-pieces...where none but master-pieces have been seen and admired" (BL II: 142) renders the Biographia as instructor, and offers the text to potential readers as both art and reform. His strategy of accommodating his text (through the lure of its confessions) to the very readership he fears seems ironic, yet it provides him an opportunity to instruct and thus to counteract the contemporary literary practices, particularly those in periodicals, that give rise to the fractured experiences of his apologia.

In their attempts to form appropriate and sympathetic readerships, then, both Coleridge and Wordsworth contest the character of middle-class culture. Wordsworth, exasperated with the public's susceptibility and indiscriminate taste, demands:

> Away, then, with the senseless iteration of the word popular, applied to new works in Poetry, as if there were no test of excellence in this first of the fine arts but that all men should run after its productions, as if urged by an appetite, or constrained by a spell! ("Essay Supplementary" 253)

This invective represents more than Wordsworth's lack of "popular" success; rather, it is an attack upon a mode of being that has disempowered the transformative reading strategy and thus directly opposes the cultural reform he

perceives as so desperately necessary. As Klancher notes, Wordsworth's "increasingly bleak strategy [is that] of a writer who casts the act of reading against ineluctable historical development itself" (Reading Audiences 144). Coleridge's cultural aspirations are intimately connected with modes of reading, as well. To assimilate his brilliant but obscure theories is to enter the intellectual elite suitable for leadership; the Biographia's combination of the erudite man of letters with the clergy facilitates Coleridge's paradigm of reform (Klancher, Reading Audiences 165):

> That to every parish throughout the kingdom there is transplanted a germ of civilization, that in the remotest villages there is a nucleus, round which the capabilities of the place may crystallize and brighten; a model sufficiently superior to excite, yet sufficiently near to encourage and facilitate, imitation. (BL I: 227)

Nonetheless, wrestling with the same social forces as Wordsworth, Coleridge comes to direct his countermeasures to specifically delineated audiences. His design to reawaken the spirituality and sense of responsibility and leadership in the "higher classes of society"--and, as Coleridge claims to have intended, the "learned" (White xxxi)--includes a corrective against

immersion in immediacy and popular attractions. Coleridge's first Lay Sermon, The Statesman's Manual, proclaims:

> If there be any antidote to that restless craving for the wonders of the day, which in conjunction with the appetite for publicity is spreading like an efflorescence on the surface of our national character; if there exist means for deriving resignation from general discontent...that antidote and these means must be sought for in the collation of the present with the past, in the habit of thoughtfully assimilating the events of our own age to those of the time before us. (8-9)

He does extend his strategy of empowerment to those outside the intellectual class; Coleridge's next work, entitled A Lay Sermon and addressed to the "higher and middle classes," emphasizes the distinction between "pleading to the Poor and Ignorant" or even "against them" and "pleading for them" (148). It is in A Lay Sermon that Coleridge means to awaken the business class to the fact "that the spirit of Trade has been a thing of insensible growth" (195). The object here is two-fold: to reassert an invigorated and integrated spirituality and thereby to contain the self-serving interests of commerce:

> Thus habitually taking for granted all truths of spiritual import leaves the understanding vacant and at leisure for a thorough

> insight into present and temporal interests: which, doubtless, is the true reason why its followers are in general such shrewd, knowing, wary, well-informed, thrifty and thriving men of business. (194)

Despite the fact that Coleridge designed this to be his "popular" text (LS 244), it seems doubtful that Coleridge's designated audience would have appreciated his assessment. The gap between intellectual and "business" interests proves as impossible for Coleridge to bridge as that between Wordsworth's nature ideology and popular culture.

As is Wordsworth's, Coleridge's anxiety concerning the reception of his philosophy (and his identity as an intellectual) is largely based on his fear of the unnamed mass readership:

> It requires some courage to avow [the truth that all men may not be philosophers] in an age and country, in which disquisitions on all subjects, not privileged to adopt technical terms or scientific symbols, must be addressed to the PUBLIC. (BL I: 235-36)

Wordsworth eventually copes with "that small though loud portion of the community, ever governed by factitious influence...the PUBLIC" by distinguishing it from his "philosophically characterised" audience, "the People" ["Essay Supplementary" 255]). This strategy essentially acknowledges his

failure to establish his reform, for it leaves the "Reader" strangely displaced from either group. Klancher suggests that despite the bleak ending to the "Essay," Wordsworth correctly envisions a future and "suprahistorical" Reader dissociated from the "recalcitrant middle-class public [of his own time] and its defensive institutions of reading" (Reading Audiences 150).

Undoubtably Coleridge's experiences of the "recalcitrant" audience determined the Biographia's form. On the most basic level, the reform manifesto authorizes his confessions by detailing Coleridge's sophisticated principles and representing his role as the cultural critic. At the same time, the digressive structure of the apologia and its accounts of the numerous embarrassments he suffers portray the fragmentation and ruin engendered by the press and society in general, and thus authorize his literary and social theory. Perhaps less obvious is the antithetical relationship between self-depiction and the creation of taste: while the confession appeals through images of ruin to popular discourse, reform requires that the writer cultivate reception for new types of thought and writing--and for the authority of the image that the theory conveys. Taken together, then, the two forms offer a culturally-relevant model of wholeness, if not unity, for a text fragmented along many axes. That Coleridge chooses to delineate his cultural critique within a record of his frustrations as a writer poignantly relates public and private concerns.

Chapter 2

Production and the Man of Letters

Coleridge's injunction to "be not merely a man of letters!" (BL I: 229) is conspicuously explicit, yet it conceals multiple definitions that mirror the contradictions contained in Coleridge's Biographia. The imperfect transition from various forms of patronage--aristocratic, political, private--to economic conditions requiring the writer to market creativity or simple skill presents a bewildering variety of options. Excruciatingly aware of the range of possibilities, Coleridge offers his totalizing command to stabilize his concept of the man of letters within his experience of historical, economic, social, and productive conditions.

I. The Man of Letters

Representations of the historical use of the term "man of letters" are neither unconflicted nor linear. For instance, John Gross, asserting that "originally the term denoted a scholar" (xiii), portrays an elite less interested in social or economic position than in intellectual pursuits. Also denoting the term's earliest usage, however, Jerome Christensen writes of the "Ciceronian ethos of the 'gentleman,' which had gilded the humanist notion of the man of

letters," and claims that, from its origination in the Renaissance, the term "was never entirely free of the stigma of commerce" (Practicing Enlightenment 10, 7). Arnold Hauser's detailed social history qualifies Christensen's term "commerce," pointing out that the English "man of letters" relied on patrons and not "direct profit" until the middle of the 1700s. Early in the same century, the cessation of the political patronage of literary men in England caused writers financial distress that, although responsible for the dissociation of the notion of "man of letters" from "gentleman," created new links between private patrons and writers (3: 44-53). Although Gross's contention that the term next denoted "authors in general...[and eventually] a writer of the second rank, a critic, someone who aimed higher than journalism but made no pretence of being primarily an artist" (xiii) situates the two in succession, certainly both states coexisted. While Gross does not specify means of financial support, both authors and critics were primarily funded by the commodification of their writing in Coleridge's time. Various formulations of the critic exist. Butler's view of the "journalist--not as a reporter only, but as a critic, watchdog, and self-appointed spokesman for the individual citizen" ("Man of Letters" 70) emphasizes social responsibility, though this altruistic notion is hardly comprehensive: Hazlitt, characterized by Herschel Baker as a "reluctant man of letters" (218), was notorious for his scathing reviews, including the "motiveless

malignity" with which he attacked Coleridge (356). Butler's later article, recognizing this phenomenon and the nineteenth century's "licensing [of] the opinionated reviewer" ("Culture's medium" 127), presents the critic's combination of personal with institutional agendas structured on publicity, circulation, and sales. Finally, co-existing with the reviewer but positioned ideologically opposite him, is the "man of letters" as the intellectual, social, and moral theorist--namely, the individual "sage." Obviously it is difficult to crystallize the "history" of a term used as fluidly as the "man of letters"; the boundaries between "types" are permeable, and expectations, financial situations, and personalities created thriving, fluctuating cultures of writers. Coleridge's awareness of this ambiguity and the connotations of historical trends fed his determination of the advantageous and ethical use of his abilities.

II. Patrons, Public, and Commerce

Certainly for Coleridge the most significant transformation is that from the patron-funded artist to the self-promoting author. Although such private individuals as the Wedgwood brothers contributed an annuity to support Coleridge as a "professional intellectual" (Butler, "Man of Letters" 70), the era of patronage was past, and gone with it were the social and financial security that had distinguished the man of letters. This notion of the financially

independent gentleman author held by Coleridge, however, is literally "romanticized"--Alvin Kernan writes that the Romantics' stand against capitalism and their promotion of "community and imagination" cast them in the role as "defender in art of certain 'higher' values and more humane ways of feeling" (Printing Technology 294). Coleridge was thus undoubtably one of those who read, as Michael McKeon phrases it, "the allure of sales and profit [for writers] as the sign of a new and insidiously impersonal form of social constraint" (22).

Conceptually opposed to an actual, unknown, fragmented readership, the idealised concept of "community" demonstrates merely one aspect of the ideological conflict embroiling the Romantic man of letters. The alienation of Romantic literature from its social context of capitalism is crucially expressed in its conflicted relationship with print (Kernan 294). The dilemma, then, and the irony, lie in the conflict between his undeniable desire for circulation and the erosion of control by the anonymous audience that print technology represents. Coleridge raises the fear of authorial dissolution, noting Herder's prediction that "he, who sends away through the pen and the press every thought, the moment it occurs to him, will in a short time have sent all away, and will become a mere journeyman of the printing-office, a compositor" (BL I: 231n). Herder suggests that the production of ideas simply for publication

transforms the author into an extension of the press itself--thus making him a servant rather than an authority. In Coleridge's view, Christensen claims, print culture both recreated the man of letters as "a wage slave to anonymous capitalists" and "chained genius to the caprices of a debased reading public" (Practicing Enlightenment 9). That this was accomplished through (ungentlemanly) financial need rendered the audience--by association--even more distasteful and threatening.

Coleridge's conviction that the writer should "NEVER PURSUE LITERATURE AS A TRADE" (BL I: 223) is underwritten by contradictory economic models. If, as in Christensen's assessment, Coleridge believed that "when pursued for bread and board [authorship] was necessarily corrupted by the taint of trade" (Practicing Enlightenment 9n), certainly here Coleridge's genteel principles coincide with his financial reality. His account of his frequent inability to compose under "necessity"--the effect of which is to "stun and stupify the mind" (BL I: 224)--admits to both his lack of economic success and his actual experience of trade. Despite Coleridge's suspicion that uncontained commercial activity daily erodes the social fabric, here his objection is limited to its connection with literature. That he advises potential authors to secure "any honourable occupation" (including the capitalistic "manufactory" [I: 224]) demonstrates a concession to necessity; based on this,

Coleridge proposes a paradigm composed of an economically-independent man of letters within the protection of his alter-ego, the man of trade. He privileges the literary orientation of this arrangement by stressing that the paid "profession" be merely some "regular employment which can be carried on so far mechanically" so that dutiful performance will yet leave strength and spirits for literary pursuits (I: 224). The notion of separation itself is central to the Biographia: "The separate motives, or rather moods of mind, which produced the preceding reflections and anecdotes have been laid open to the reader in each separate instance" (I: 223). Coleridge recognizes the incongruity of the man of trade as (gentle)man of letters, yet normalizes it by advocating a distinction between the "genius" (to create) and the "talent" (used in paid employment); to allocate each to separate realms "will alike ennoble both" (I: 224).

III. Coleridge at Trade: Private and Public Journals

Indeed, Coleridge had first-hand experience of the decidedly ignoble state facing the man of letters who makes literature his trade. In the Biographia, Coleridge recirculates the episode of his first private periodical: The Watchman becomes the vehicle for both a personable, humorously anecdotal dismissal of a misadventure in his early role as man of print culture and an opportunity to

represent himself as perhaps too refined to succeed in trade. Characterizing his enterprise as a "business" and his own position as "an author trading on his own account" (BL I: 181), he thus emphasizes independent commerce rather than literary activity, and justifies Christensen's assertion that the "merchant [is] a progenitor of the emergent and newly dominant man of letters" (Practicing Enlightenment 153); cast in the light of Coleridge's hardly-dominant journal and its brief existence, however, the representation transforms into critique. The very qualities of the (gentle)man of letters render him unsuited and unnatural for the business of marketing his own writings. Initially "persuaded" by a known audience of acquaintances, Coleridge acknowledges in retrospect his "lack of worldly knowledge" (BL I: 179) in proffering his texts to an unknown, undifferentiated public. Having asserted this readership's lack of interest and outright alienation from his scholarly insights, Coleridge employs the experience to support his position as an intellectual rather than as a man of commerce.

The Biographia's self-mocking portrayal, however, obscures the very real selectivity with which Coleridge elected to trade upon his writing. Undoubtably the endeavour was motivated largely by financial need, yet, as Colmer asserts, that Coleridge rejected the more secure position of writing for an established national daily (on the grounds that he held an aversion to London), and refused

on principle to write in provincial papers that represented the interests of the Ministry, demonstrates that economics were not Coleridge's single focus (32). Instead, the "scholarly, critical, speculative" studies designed to prepare him for the Church (Bate 23) had produced a mind bent on "disseminating political wisdom" (Colmer 32) and the concept of The Watchman presented the seductive combination of independence, expression, and profit. In other words, at this point Coleridge easily conceived of the fusion of the man of letters with (at least private) trade; his gentility could be satisfied by the knowledge that he was acting on his own authority. As a one-man operation, The Watchman evaded the conditions of institutional journalism--namely, layers of textual interference by editors and publishers--and apparently offered Coleridge an impressive command of his texts's themes and production. This is particularly significant in view of Coleridge's aim to dispense "(what [he] believed to be) the truth, and the will of [his] maker" (BL I: 180); both Coleridge's writings and his charismatic tour to secure subscriptions attempted to generate a readership unified by its reception of the ideology of a visionary. Certainly Coleridge was not alone in this strategy of producing unmediated opinion--Cobbett's self-publishing Political Register enjoyed extended success--yet, The Watchman failed partially because, as Klancher points out, the "middle-class writer now

had to become institutional to survive" (Reading Audiences 48; emphasis added).

Coleridge must have shared this intuition, at least on a practical level; although his employment with the Morning Post appears to contradict his resistance to institutional writing, the pre-existing formation of its readership largely removed anxiety about both finances and audience--at least for his political thought. Although, as J. R. de J. Jackson notes, "Coleridge always seems to have found working for hire a cramping business" (Coleridge's Criticism 3), the assertion of his individuality and his insistence upon minimal textual mediation somewhat preserves his authorial integrity:

> I was solicited...and acceded to the proposal on the condition, that the paper should thenceforwards be conducted on certain fixed and announced principles, and that I should be neither obliged or requested to deviate from them in favor of any party or any event. (BL I: 212)

That editor Daniel Stuart asserted that the paper's political direction was established prior to Coleridge's arrival (I: 212n) reveals Coleridge's statement to be posturing; his intent was to elevate his position in relationship to his employers and differentiate it from that of writers for partisan journals. He seems to have conceived his role in the model of the socially motivated critic as

man of letters as depicted by Marilyn Butler: "the man of letters made it his object to carry weight, to wield a kind of moral authority that had nothing to do with political power and perhaps reached beyond the power of individuals in the modern state" ("Man of Letters" 71). Determined, no doubt, to distinguish himself as this type of professional political critic, Coleridge's style changed noticeably while writing for the Morning Post. The elimination of "excessive rhetoric," Colmer states, derives from the fact that, in addressing the Morning Post's established audience, Coleridge wrote for "a known public" rather than negotiating his "uncertain relationship" (79) with the readers of The Watchman. Nonetheless, as a site from which to engage in literary discourse, Coleridge found the impersonal periodical unsatisfactory: "the job proved irksome" (BL I: 212n) in that he felt paid journalism and its constraints to be degrading, and that the time devoted to commercial ends consumed the possibility of realizing the great works he imagined (Doughty 169).

It seems undeniable that the limitations of the Morning Post's audience and direction were a further irritation; in 1809, Coleridge's determination to produce "vital truths" for the benefit of "all who were prepared to grapple with them" (Colmer 88) led him to establish The Friend. The difficulties of production and finances he experienced with The Watchman seem to have been subordinated in Coleridge's mind to the benefits of the sympathetic readership

he envisioned. His perception that the format offered benefits to both writer and reader does have a measure of validity: first, the punctuality demanded by periodical publishing (he had successfully coped with this at the Morning Post) should have concerted his energies; secondly, he believed that readers would be able to absorb his admittedly abstruse ideas while awaiting the next issue (Colmer 90). The self-concept that Coleridge developed as man of letters in trade, however, based upon his performance with the Morning Post, overestimated his own practical resources. Furthermore, the periodical format proved unsuitable for Coleridge's immethodical presentation of his unusual insights (Colmer 90, 119). The Friend's "dullness, obscurity, and consequent lack of appeal for the average reader" combined with poor arrangements for material production that generated "frequent interruption in the continuity of publication" (Doughty 352) to complicate circulation and audience formation. As with The Watchman, the unreliability of subscription lists metonymically representing unknown patrons demonstrated the crippling impersonality of print culture: "On my list of subscribers, among a considerable number of names equally flattering, was that of an Earl of Cork...He might as well have been an Earl of Bottle," Coleridge asserts, "for aught I knew of him" (BL I: 176). Coleridge's application in 1809 to contribute regularly to The Courier while already occupied with The Friend indicates his economic distress. Although he

at one point served six months as editorial assistant, his assigned topics were seldom deeply significant, and, Colmer claims, writing for this national journal did not generate the "new vigour and lucidity" that his work for The Morning Post had (121). Nonetheless, his "140-odd contributions" span the period from 1804 to 1818 (BL I: 215n) and, while his creativity was inhibited by his lack of investment in the subjects dictated, his literary integrity remained intact; Colmer reports that again, Coleridge "was not willing to acquiesce in the suppression of truth nor prepared to use his literary talents in disseminating purely ministerial or party views" (123). Coleridge presents his own failure in the periodical publication of The Friend as proof that to "attempt in any way to unite the functions of author and publisher" must be avoided:

> I warn all others from the attempt to deviate from the ordinary mode of publishing a work by the trade...the most prudent mode is to sell the copy-right...for the most that the trade will offer. By few only can a large remuneration be expected; but fifty pounds and ease of mind are of more real advantage to a literary man, than the chance of five hundred and the certainty of insult and degrading anxieties. (BL I: 177).

Though forced to commodify his texts, the literary man operates as a private individual, a gentleman, potentially injured through public "insult and degrading

anxieties" that would likely be avoided or harmlessly absorbed by an institutional publisher. For the true man of letters, then, "money, and immediate reputation form only an arbitrary and accidental end of literary labor" (I: 224). Coleridge's simultaneous involvement in both public and private journalism prefigures his distinction between trade and letters: his position with the Courier situates him within the trade, and thus finances the profoundly intellectual expression in The Friend that locates him in the realm of letters. He interprets his financially and emotionally devastating failure in the role of publisher as further proof that literature is an art, and not a trade, for the man of letters.

This distinction is fundamental to the Biographia's proclamation that the decline of literature derives from the economic and social realities driving print culture. Such an environment produces, Coleridge asserts:

> Men, who being first scriblers from idleness and ignorance next become libellers from envy and malevolence; have been able to drive a successful trade in the employment of the booksellers, nay have raised themselves into temporary name and reputation with the public at large, by that most powerful of all adulation, the appeal to the bad and malignant passions of mankind. (I: 41)

The implication that the combined allure of profit and unregulated influence attracts a decidedly "un-lettered" class of writers also suggests that, "of all trades, literature at present demands the least talent or information" (I: 39). Literature pursued as a trade is populated with opportunists and is unsuitable for the literary man. The expanding possibilities for popular writers lead to texts and treatises by the unqualified who produce a "multitude of books, and the general diffusion of literature" (I: 38). Coleridge observes that knowledge is dissipated in an expanding morass that impairs the realm of letters itself: reduced from "religious oracles" to "venerable preceptors," books declined further to "instructive friends," and are finally debased to "culprits" of self-justification (I: 57).

Contingent upon this shift in the definition of literature, of course, is the re-definition of critical practice. Coleridge implicates the development of new readerships in the de-formalization of the writer/audience relationship and the resulting transfer of critical authority to "the multitudinous PUBLIC" (I: 59). That these new readers both promote and are informed by (periodical) writers in the trade is particularly threatening to Coleridge in that serious works, designed for an intellectual audience, face evaluation by the unqualified, uneducated reader-as-judge and his mentor, the publicity-oriented reviewer. In a sense the development helps Coleridge in the Biographia to differentiate his own

distinction of the man of letters from that of the writer by trade. This is not unproblematic, given Coleridge's experience as a reviewer--and particularly the fact that the review of Bertram included in the Biographia was originally an anonymous submission to the Courier (Engell and Bate lxiv). However, the notion of the "man of letters" as "critic" had (at least) two distinct applications: the first relied, as did Coleridge, on "integrity, idealism and humane concern" (Butler, "Man of Letters" 71), while the second employed "the seductively readable style of 'slashing' criticism" (Butler, "Culture's medium" 132). In the Biographia Coleridge feels it necessary to defend his writer-for-hire contributions to the Morning Post and the Courier:

> Yet in these labors I employed, and in the belief of partial friends wasted, the prime and manhood of my intellect. Most assuredly, they added nothing to my fortune or my reputation. The industry of the week supplied the necessities of the week. From Government or the friends of Government I not only never received remuneration, or ever expected it; but I was never honoured with a single acknowledgement, or expression of satisfaction. (I: 215)

This selfless industry overwrites, for Coleridge, a distasteful connection with trade and locates him in the genteel domain of his literary promise. The

extensive criticism Coleridge performs in the Biographia draws on this potential, recreating the world of letters he envisions as a corrective to the paid reviews.

IV. The Biographia: Ideology and Production

It is indicative of Coleridge's ideology that, although he suggests that the Biographia's production problems would add to his "Chapter concerning Authorship as a Trade" (BL II: 237), he does not expand on the details. Driven by his need to preserve his text from any scent of commerce, Coleridge alludes lightly to the delay in printing. Yet, before discussion of financial implications arises, he draws the reader back to the genteel dream: "But ere I speak of myself in the tones, which are alone natural to me under the circumstances of late years, I would fain present myself to the Reader as I was in the first dawn of my literary life" (II: 159). To "present" himself is precisely Coleridge's intention, and to present himself as the scholar of letters requires that the Biographia minimize his role in its production and economics. His actual involvement was necessarily extensive, and although Biographia Literaria is an impressive demonstration of Coleridge's diverse inspirations and erudite authority, it was also, Jackson asserts, a means of raising funds to pay creditors

in "one of the most [financially] desperate periods of his life" (Coleridge's Criticism 12).

Coleridge's further desire to conceal the circumstances of the Biographia's translation into print relates to the radical influence of the material conditions of publication. Admittedly the text's expansive metamorphosis (enacted by his inspired dictation and his long-proposed plans for an autobiography) initiated this; however, production seriously impinged upon Coleridge's authorial intentions. The concern for the formal presentation of the product at the expense of the effective arrangement of its text indicates precisely that impersonal nature of the press that Coleridge dreaded. Although Engell and Bate suggest that Coleridge's failure to provide adequate poetry to produce Sibylline Leaves as a volume of equal size to the Biographia resulted in the decision to split the larger text (lix), production was held back and the text's contents were "padded" because the division was advocated and determined without consideration for the strategic placement of the writings themselves. The printer Gutch wanted only to divide the work in two; however, to salvage the "continuity" of the Biographia, Coleridge discovered, would necessitate an extensive addition: dividing the text thematically at Chapter 14 would ultimately leave Volume II 150 pages shorter than Volume I (lix-lxii). This solution produced a significant delay between the printing of the initial and final

texts of the Biographia: while the original "final chapter" was printed in July 1816, the expanded, revised publication was not released until July 1817. Coleridge's task was to extend Chapter 22, compose the conclusion, and select the further material required from the miscellaneous pieces of writing he had at hand (lxii-lxv). While this method of construction produced a visually marketable set and allowed Coleridge to extend significant contemporary insights, the additions of "Satyrane's Letters" and the Critique of Bertram to Volume II impair Coleridge's authority: they appear an unintegrated concession to the demands of print.

V. Repressions and Self-Representation

Coleridge's self-distancing from the details of production, popularity, and economics relating to his solely "literary" projects--namely, those not overtly connected with trade--is as essential to his self-image in the Biographia as is his recollection of the failure of his private journals. Although Coleridge was under constant financial pressure, he was involved in numerous successful ventures and, as Engell and Bate note, "except for the Wedgwood annuity, which he assigned to his wife, [Coleridge] had been supporting himself by 'literature', writing or lecturing, for the past twenty years" (BL I: 223n). Nonetheless, Coleridge claims:

> [I] provided for my scanty maintenance by writing verses for a London Morning Paper [the Morning Post]. I saw plainly, that literature was not a profession, by which I could expect to live; for I could not disguise from myself...that...my talents ...were not of the sort that could enable me to become a popular writer. (I: 187).

Certainly by the time of the Biographia's writing, Coleridge had had reason to reconsider this. Although his complex metaphysics and philosophical insights were hardly fashionable, Engell and Bate note that in 1811-12 Coleridge gave his "famous lectures on Shakespeare and Milton...which not only are one of the classics of English criticism but aroused popular interest at the time," and attracted even Byron's notice. The performance of Remorse in 1813 refuelled his popularity, transforming Coleridge "overnight [into] a celebrity" (xliv), yet his remarks in the Biographia relate solely to the "moral value of the truths" (BL I: 220) disseminated in his lectures. He frames his enjoyment of his tragedy's "complete success" in terms of his personal connection to the many who had attended his lectures that then "crowded" "the pit and boxes" (I: 221). Despite the fact that, as Jackson emphasizes, Remorse was extremely profitable and Coleridge was delighted (Critical Heritage 7), notions of commercial gain connected with Coleridge's art are repressed in the text. This selective representation is consistent with Coleridge's ideology of the personal,

intellectual, moral, and social interests of the man of letters and his ultimate separation from trade. That Coleridge reconstructs the economic circumstances of his "literary life" quite exclusively through episodes of his financially disastrous private journal enterprises confirms his intention to de-naturalize his connection with commerce.

The circumstances of Coleridge's life--and his interpretation of them--are informed by his reluctant participation in a social/economic system that makes his own role dependent upon popular response. The Biographia is a record of the ways in which Coleridge resists the commercial role of the writer and attempts to reposition the man of letters within a private sphere protected from financial and public influence. The sub-text of the admonition to "Be not merely a man of letters!" (BL I: 229) disconnects the economically-susceptible mere man of letters from his need for trade by proposing a form of self-patronage, and thus providing a return (albeit an idealised one) to a literature of moral authority and social criticism. Although Coleridge continued to support himself by writing, his texts followed this code, and eventually helped him to the role that Butler names the "sage" ("Man of Letters" 91) as man of letters.

Chapter 3

Publication and Periodical Reception

The difficulties of production that plagued the Biographia Literaria literally transformed it into a document that responds to periodical discourse from a uniquely sensitized position. Informed by the experience of reviews of Christabel and The Statesman's Manual, Coleridge re-addresses the text's existing critique surrounding the act and ideology of criticism. His discussion, and that of the reviewers, target issues of identity and meaning in a milieu wherein style may be the only marker of authorship and personality is a function of publicity. The conflation of writer with text and of anonymous reviewers with editor and publisher problematizes issues of authority and generates anxiety concerning interpretation, authenticity, and mediation. Situated amidst the fervid critical attention directed at Coleridge's burst of publications, Biographia Literaria highlights the self-reflexivity and discursiveness of the practice of reviewing and the inscription of the press in the power relations that bind critic, author, and readership.

I. The Biographia's Extension: Response to the Reviews

In the one-year interval between the interruption of Biographia Literaria's printing in July of 1816 and its publication in July, 1817, Coleridge produced not only (three editions of) Christabel but also the provocative Statesman's Manual. Furthermore, throughout this period Coleridge's most lucrative work, the 1813 tragedy, Remorse, received continued support and popular attention. Although he was conscious of the response to Remorse before beginning Biographia Literaria, the split in the Biographia's printing meant that Coleridge was also aware of the reviews of Christabel and The Statesman's Manual prior to his extension of Chapter 22 and his writing of the Conclusion. He was thus able to extend the critique of reviewing practices already so central to the text and to enter into the critical discourse of these works. His "Literary Life," inherently invested in the mediating effect of the press upon his reputation and fortunes and already a vehicle for the performance and analysis of critical technique, offered the opportunity to engage the reviews directly.

In September, 1816, the Edinburgh Review printed a searing critique of Coleridge's Christabel; his response, in fact, attempted to reveal the ideology of anonymity in the conduct of reviews generally. Coleridge rejects the illusion of impersonality attendant upon the unsigned review and re-establishes personal liability as a principle, claiming that "private enmity...personal enmity behind

the mask of anonymous criticism" (BL II: 239) motivates the reviewer. He further describes the practice of attack itself: "a certain proportion of abuse and ridicule [is necessary in] a Review, in order to make it saleable" (II: 239). These comments reiterate his assessment in the extended Chapter 22 that "a Review, in order to be a saleable article, must be personal, sharp, and pointed" (II: 157); the suggestion is that the review be "personal" both in its character of the author and as the personal opinion of the reviewer. His analysis identifies the commodification of the subjective and the dissemination of "private enmity" for public consumption. On the other hand, Coleridge's objection to the "malignity and a spirit of personal hatred that ought to have injured only the work in which such a Tirade was suffered to appear" (II: 239) not only confronts the writer but also indicts the institution and (complicit as consumers) the readership. Identifying reviewing as a process that transforms men and confers licence, Coleridge asserts that "with the pen out of their hand they are honorable men" (II: 157).

Certainly Coleridge had cause to wonder at the honour of reviewers; in the same month that the crushing review of Christabel appeared in the Edinburgh Review, The Statesman's Manual received a pre-publication critique in the Examiner. Coleridge, incensed at this attack, declared that the action "disgraces and endangers the liberty of the press" (II: 241-2). The comment

resonates with a warning of the responsibilities and potential abuses of print culture; it raises questions about the primacy of periodicals over individuals, for the critic, exercising his "freedom of the press," impairs Coleridge's right to a reception unbiased by previous exposure. The Statesman's Manual was nonetheless released in December, 1816 and reviewed again by the same reviewer in both the Examiner and the Edinburgh Review of that month. Coleridge's Biographia Literaria response questions the institutional influences acting upon the Edinburgh Review's writer, claiming that the "employer and suborner" were responsible (II: 242). In a variation of the thought that reviewers are "honorable men" when not writing, Coleridge rebuts his attacker by offering a generous assessment of the intellectual abilities of this reviewer while simultaneously refusing to ascribe agency to him. The "rhapsody of...insult" was "pre-determined"; Coleridge regards the "Rhapsodist" personally with "grief" (II: 242), presumably at his loss of integrity.

The separation of writerly, periodical-supported subjectivity from the "honorable" man is an insight that probably owes much to Coleridge's feelings of rejection; he was convinced that his former admirer William Hazlitt was the writer of the offending articles. Coleridge's remarks that the Christabel review was "generally attributed (whether rightly or no I know not) to a man, who both in my presence and in my absence has repeatedly pronounced it the finest poem

of its kind" (II: 239) echoes personal loss while it emphasizes the influence of public opinion and its power to subordinate the possibility of error. In fact, the authorship of the review remains undetermined (II: 239n); Coleridge's remarks about identity, authority, and both public and personal competence reflect his anxieties about print culture. His consignment of the December Edinburgh Review article to the editor's credit leaves the reviewer Hazlitt disempowered--an instrument rather than an agent--even while it distinguishes this from Hazlitt personally: Coleridge claims him as the "man" he would have selected for "the vigour of his mind, and from his particular acuteness in speculative reasoning" (II: 242).

Reviewers themselves also sought to produce a particular image of the author--and to facilitate their own production through his. Ostensibly concerned with the author's performance in relation to his audience, issues were invested with the power dynamic of the reviewer's relation to the public. Both Hazlitt's Christabel review in the June 2, 1816 Examiner and (the unattributed) Edinburgh Review's article chastise Coleridge for his treatment of his readers. Hazlitt claims that Coleridge deliberately shocks the readership in order to demonstrate his "pretended contempt for the opinion of the public" (CH 206) while the Edinburgh Review pronounces "this publication...one of the boldest experiments that has yet been made on the patience or understanding of the

public" (CH 234). The relationship thus structured aligns the public with the critic against the abusive author and capitalizes upon the shock-value of both work and review. As Hazlitt[2] comments on The Statesman's Manual in the December, 1816 Edinburgh Review:

> Would Mr. Coleridge, with impious hand, turn the world 'twice ten degrees askance,' and carry us back to the dark ages? Would he punish the reading public for their bad taste in reading periodical publications which he does not like, by suppressing the freedom of the press altogether, or destroying the art of printing? (451)

Hazlitt's portrait of Coleridge depicts him as regressive and positions the periodical ideologically and practically not only with the broader "art of printing" but also with principles of liberty and progress. His reiteration of Coleridge's phrase "the reading public" in this context marks its conservatism and further displaces Coleridge's connection to the public.

The anxiety surrounding publication and audience is formulated by Henry Crabb Robinson in an article on The Statesman's Manual in the Critical Review, January, 1817: "Readers must be first formed by writers, but without an immediate expectation of readers there will be no publishers" (43). The identification and cultivation of an audience is precisely Coleridge's project, yet

publication poses considerable risk: as he claims, "anonymous critics" with "glaring perversions and misstatements...knowingly strive to make it impossible for the man even to publish any future work without exposing himself to the wretchedness of debt and embarrassment" (BL II: 157). The distinction between "anonymous critic" and "man" is calculated to differentiate the positions by the sphere in which they operate. Coleridge implies that the reviewer occupies a subjective, ethereal space as opposed to the objective, real-world location of the author of texts; this separation attempts to redirect the discourse and to assert the practical authority of Coleridge the man.

By composing texts aimed at differing and specific audiences, Coleridge contests the notion that writings are merely reproductions of the author's monolithic character and reputation. Although the metaphysical nature of The Statesman's Manual demonstrates Coleridge's undisputable displacement from popular thought, meaning was coded for interpretation by the higher and "clerkly" classes. Hazlitt's September 8, 1816 Examiner anticipatory review effectually rejects Coleridge's writings on the basis of their inaccessibility to the public; he claims that "we see no sort of difference between his published and his unpublished compositions. It is just as difficult to get at the meaning of the one as the other" (571). While this proclamation means to produce a particular image of Coleridge and his abilities, in fact, it clearly indicates the method of

the review: the work need not even be published because its reception will be determined by its author's reputation. Coleridge complains that he has been "gossipped about, as devoted to metaphysics" and that "as therefore my character as a writer could not easily be more injured by an overt act...I published [The Statesman's Manual], a large portion of which was professedly metaphysical" (BL II: 240-1). His direction of the second Lay Sermon to the middle classes, however, and his plans to write a third "to the Lower and Labouring Classes of Society" (White xxxi) demonstrate his awareness that audience and meaning exist in relation to one another.

II. The Biographia's Initial Critique

Coleridge was preoccupied with the practice of reviews and codes of criticism long before the attacks on Christabel and The Statesman's Manual, and his critique of periodicals forms an essential part of the pre-extension (1815) text of Biographia Literaria. Nonetheless, because the Biographia was not released prior to the inflammatory reviews, "a book meant as a serious commentary on the methods of reviewing was mistaken for a wholly personal riposte" (Jackson, CH 12). To those without publication information, Chapter 21, entitled "Remarks on the present mode of conducting critical journals" (BL II: 107-18) appears to be a pointed response to the hostile reviews; the chapter is

directed almost exclusively to the Edinburgh Review (after which the "Quarterly" only is cited, and then as "its only corrival" [II: 113]). That Coleridge directs a portion of his autobiography to a detailed evaluation of the shortcomings and compromised intentions of "the first important review completely independent of publishers" (II: 108n) indicates the degree to which the "Literary Life" was influenced by reviewing practice. Although Coleridge centres his complaint on the Edinburgh Review's departure from the principles upon which it claimed to be based, his critique attempts to replace the emphasis on the personal with a formal code of criticism. His objections address not only the quality of the material selected for review but also distinctions between private and public, personal and textual, and argumentative versus assertive reviewing techniques.

Although Coleridge reacted to the reviews of Christabel and The Statesman's Manual with remarks about publicity, reputation, and reception, the initial section of the Biographia examined this relationship two years earlier. His distinction between the text under review and the reputation of its author theorizes the separation of "public personality" and text: Coleridge is content "as long as the author is addressed or treated as the mere impersonation of the work then under trial" (II: 108). However, "as soon as the critic betrays, that he knows more of his author, than the author's publications could have told

him...censure instantly becomes personal injury" (II: 109). This gesture means to distil a type of critical practice purified of sensationalism and personal attack; it conceives of the review as literary endeavour rather than commodified representation.

Coleridge's stated objections to the Edinburgh Review derive from its disregard of the principles of conduct that it proclaimed when forming its initial audience. The mutability of that audience, however, embeds it within a changing discourse as periodicals generate "patterns of reception" (Klancher, Reading Audiences 33). Writing, production, and means of distribution combine in the act of circulation; through "repeated acts of certain kinds of writing and reading...a public is shaped to read discourses in deliberate, directed ways" (Klancher, Reading Audiences 33). Certainly that "way" of reading criticism for its literary authority was suppressed by the growing interest in a type of review that celebrated the personal and conflated private with public. J.R. de J. Jackson notes that "there had been a change in the manners of reviewing...[that] ushered in an era of literary partisanship and provocation" (Critical Heritage 9). As Coleridge asserts, the review as product is subject to its marketability: "there was a cold prudential pre-determination to increase the sale of the Review by flattering the malignant passions of human nature" (BL II: 112). The remark demonstrates his antipathy to "the pervasive effects of

philosophical materialism" of which "print culture" was symptomatic (Morrow 162).

In targeting the Edinburgh Review, Coleridge precisely identifies and attempts to counteract a shift in the conduct of reviews that bears considerable social and literary significance. By resurrecting the standards upon which the Edinburgh Review was established, namely its proposal to review "those books only, which are susceptible and deserving of argumentative criticism" (II: 108; emphasis added), he attempts to reverse the direction of profitable "arbitrary and sometimes petulant verdicts" (BL II: 113). Coleridge's strategy would modify the effects of the critic as "gossip" (II: 109) by separating books from the context of their authors' publicity and requiring a systematic and rational evaluation of textual merit (II: 113). Undoubtably the Biographia's ideal concept of journal discourse prefigures Habermas's notion of the early periodical as an instrument of public debate wherein the critic's arguments (rather than his status) generated his authority (41). Coleridge correctly notes the Edinburgh's implication in the transformation of periodical discourse from a system that at least attempted objective criticism to one based on opinion. Although Roper's account suggests that early eighteenth-century reviews were often influenced by personal affiliations and antagonism (33), the contributions of readers did form a critical dialogue similar to Habermas's model. From 1802,

however, following the example (rather than the stated ideals) of the Edinburgh Review, hired writers often reified "aggressively and voluminously stated" opinion as authority (Roper 45). To demonstrate this phenomenon, Coleridge claims that in a critique of Wordsworth's poems the connection between quoted text and review was so obscure that "the reviewer, having written his critique before he had read the work, had then pricked with a pin for passages" (II: 113).

That the social structure Coleridge proposes in the Lay Sermons is hardly a "public sphere" indicates that he aims not to produce a society directed by bourgeois consensus but to reform the conditions of public information. As John Morrow points out, Coleridge is convinced of a correlation "between the quality of the audience...and the intellectuals whose judgements in the reviews tended to elevate the unworthy and to condemn the worthy to oblivion" (162). Coleridge's critique identifies the practice of anonymous reviewing with an insidious type of critical impunity; the strategy of effacing the identity of the writer provides the appearance of empirical, institutional authority that elides judgement. Reiterating Andrew Marvel's phrase, Coleridge laments that, "authorised as 'synodical individuals,'" "they are then no longer to be questioned without exposing the complainant to ridicule, because, forsooth, they are anonymous critics" (BL I: 42). The collective consciousness that the anonymous reviewer implicitly claims to represent is not simply the opinions of

his peers but also the entire project of the periodical itself; even its readership is implicated--the reviewer can lay claim to "our readers" and presume that subscription indicates satisfaction and complicity. Anonymity facilitates what Klancher describes as an "authorless" text, namely, "an institution blending writer, editor, and publisher" (Reading Audiences 51). The creation of opinion as public performance relies on a writer who claims to adhere to a universal standard of criticism but may represent journal ideology or interests. (Consider Coleridge's accusation of Hazlitt.) This is not to say that reviewers adopt a generic or de-personalized tone; indeed, style becomes the single marker by which the anonymous critic may be distinguished. Readers' identification of the writer's style is a means of producing "the relation of the audience to the writer hidden behind the corporate text" (Klancher Reading Audiences 51). Ironically, the trend to anonymity in critics is balanced by the readership's desire for public personalities. One of Coleridge's complaints relates to his treatment as a figure by the press: "year after year, quarter after quarter, month after month...I have been for at least 17 years consecutively dragged forth by them into the foremost ranks of the proscribed" (BL I: 50). In fact, from 1798 to 1814 there are more than "ninety articles and reviews" that refer to Coleridge "in specific detail"; although Engell and Bate note that the largest number are positive or less damaging than Coleridge suggests (I: 50n), it seems obvious that the

periodicals' production of "Coleridge" facilitated periodical sales rather than authorial influence.

III. 1813-17: Reception, Publicity, Autobiography

The context in which Biographia Literaria resides is significant for its print culture concerns with influence, mediation, and audience in the focus and language of the reviews. Review articles of Remorse, Christabel, The Statesman's Manual, and Biographia Literaria offer the opportunity to examine the specialized production and interpretation of public character and its connection to textual assessment within a condensed timeframe (1813-1817). The experience of the reviews informs Coleridge's attempt to embed his corrective to the manners of reviewing within his self-representation; in this sense, the Biographia particularly invites commentary on reputation and the connection of the production of image to production of text. Critical appraisal of Remorse emphasizes the medium through which Coleridge's reputation is produced; in this process, the review's representation affirms its own significance. Thomas Barnes, in the January 31, 1813 edition of the Examiner, claims that:

> Mr. Coleridge, whose poetic talents are undisputed, though they are deformed by sentimentalities, and whines, and infant lispings,

> has, it appears, hardened by the public ordeal which he has for some years undergone, manfully disregarded the pelting scorn of many a critic, and ventures now to lay his claims before a mixed multitude. (CH 122)

By mimicking Coleridge's complaints of his "public ordeal," the reviewer self-reflexively draws attention to periodical practice and establishes its interest in creating and reproducing the public figure. The review's access to the "multitude" permits it to mediate Coleridge's text and to create its own public character simultaneously. In the European Magazine, November, 1816, G.F. Mathew utilizes the same mode of self-construction: his comment that Christabel "may have been...trampled upon by the cold-blooded critic by profession" (CH 236) positions the reviewer as "professional" and impartial--ironically, characteristics that Coleridge had promoted in the Biographia. Although Mathew's use of the subjective "trampled" seems hardly congruent with his claim to professionalism, the projection of the reviewer as serious critic is one often thematized in periodicals. The anonymous reviewer in the May, 1813 edition of the British Review interprets the figure of the reviewer as reader and dutiful critic: "We cannot help reckoning the task of reading to the end of the tragedy of Remorse, with the attention requisite to form a judgment of its merits, among the wearisome labours to which a Reviewer submits" (CH 171).

The unsigned Biographia Literaria review in the British Critic of November, 1817 responds to Coleridge's review concerns with an ideal view that neglects to account for the emulative aspects of discourse. The critic inflates the position of the periodical by positing the system of reviews as a generator of "truth": "If one party condemn in excess, another will generally be found to praise in an equal excess...the real truth gradually separates itself from the errors" (468).

As self-perceived agents of the public, reviewers concern themselves with the relationship between audience, accessibility, and character. Hazlitt, in particular, interrogates Coleridge's intentions and connections to his readership; evaluating the discrepancies between Coleridge's various textual and verbal directions intended to identify the audience of The Statesman's Manual, he accuses Coleridge of "systematic antipathy to the Reading Public" (Examiner December 29, 1816 827). He takes his critique so far as to portray Coleridge as alienated generally from the public and further, from himself: Coleridge possesses "no opinion that any body else holds, or even he himself, for two moments together" (Edinburgh Review December, 1816 446). In the January, 1817 edition of the Critical Review, that lack of connection is echoed more gently by Henry Crabb Robinson. In his assessment (also of The Statesman's Manual), "the author's great mistake has been, we apprehend, the supposing that

the higher classes, 'men of clerkly acquirements', would be willing to acquiesce in that kind of [foreign metaphysical] abstraction" (44).

The project of determining the meaning of Biographia Literaria incited critical response (sensitized by Coleridge's critique of reviewing practices) to attack the text in various ways. Engell and Bate assess the reaction as "generally unfavourable" and claim that it focused on the text's disorganization, its attack on reviewing, and the metaphysical content (BL I: lxv). Certainly other often-addressed complaints were the perceived unsuitability of the autobiographical genre in general, for Coleridge in particular, and the combination of his life and theories in the same text. An unsigned review attributed to "Christopher North" (John Wilson) in the October, 1817 edition of Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine, complains of the inclusion of the personal in the "'Literary Life'"; the text "lays open, not unfrequently, the character of the Man as well as of the Author...after which it seems impossible that Mr. Coleridge can be greatly respected either by the Public or himself" (CH 328). At stake is the author's contribution to the production of his own public character. The writer's insistence that the personal be held separate from the professional disregards the frequent conflation of personality with author in critiques by reviewers themselves.

The tension between the periodical's capacity for publicity and that of individual authors is partially explained by resistance to autobiography as a genre. "North" demands: "What good to mankind has ever flowed from the confessions of Rousseau, or the autobiographical sketch of Hume?...we rise with a confused and miserable sense of weakness and of power, of lofty aspirations and degrading appentencies" (CH 327). This opinion is echoed in the unsigned review in the New Monthly Magazine of August, 1817, "Self-biography is a very delicate undertaking, and few instances can be mentioned wherein it has yielded satisfaction" (CH 322); the British Critic's unsigned review of November, 1817, holds that the author who "sets down to record the history of his own life and opinions...certainly affords a presumption that he conceives himself to be an object of greater curiosity with the public, than it is quite modest in any man to suppose" (460). These reviews emphasize questions surrounding the validity and implications of self-definition, and the tension between publicly-reported and personally-recorded representation. The British Critic's reviewer, however, resolves the dilemma by dismissing the matter of autobiography entirely. His approach raises interesting issues of referentiality, authenticity, and mediation when he offers the text to his audience as "a literary performance...rather than as a record of facts connected with the life of its author" (462). The "literary life" thus dissolves into a commodity wherein the

referent and its truth-claims are insignificant; as text, it must be mediated to its audience by critical interpretation.

The notion of life as performance is raised at several points in the Biographia Literaria reviews. "North" rages that Coleridge "has sought every opportunity of keeping himself in the eye of the public" (CH 334) and that "his name, too, has been often foisted into Reviews, and accordingly is known to many who never saw any of his works" (330). Assigning agency to Coleridge for his own publicity, "North" both negates and asserts the power of the periodical: it is incapable of preventing Coleridge's intrusion, yet its dissemination is so pervasive that an audience is created for an artist of unseen works. "Name" is symbolic of accumulated reputation; its emphasis occurs also in the British Critic's unsigned review: "His name is familiar to numbers who are altogether unacquainted with his compositions" (460). That both the writer and Coleridge attribute Coleridge's fame not to his own literary activity but to his connection with Wordsworth and Southey, merely underscores the periodical's role as manufacturer of publicity and producer of personality. The public figure's ability to intervene in this process is questionable; the anonymous reviewer in the British Critic asserts that "an author has no better right to complain in such a case of the injury done to his private interests, by

anonymous criticism...authors are just as much public characters as secretaries of state are" (467).

The relationship between public discourse and the right to self-representation are central to Biographia Literaria. Coleridge insistently challenges the practice of the interpretation of texts by the measure of the public character. His analysis interrogates the configuration of power between individual, public, and publishing institution, and attempts not only to educate his audience but to intervene in the alienation of (anonymous) critics from their responsibility for their representations. The strategy of embedding a critique of publicity and print culture in a published autobiography is complex and provocative; it demands a separation of imposed "personality" from the text, while supplying instead Coleridge's own interpretation of his life and its implication in authorship and criticism. Coleridge's autobiography embraces the tensions of access and audience, representation and mediation. His engagement in the periodical discourse generated by his texts both illuminates and contextualizes his "Literary Life and Opinions."

Conclusion

Coleridge's concept of intent for both personal representation and public reform, his negotiation of production, and his response to the reception of his Biographia are all deeply invested in Romantic discourses competing to redefine both literature and society. His "literary life" is valuable precisely because it registers concerns not simply contained within the Romantic period, but extending into cultural studies in our own time. As I began this study by contextualizing the Biographia Literaria within theories of historical development, so I will conclude by suggesting its relevance to our future understanding of "knowledge," its transmission, and its formation as literature.

It is perhaps not all that surprising that the dominance of technology over all forms of art is a critical Romantic fear and that, late in the twentieth century, we feel its realization. Undoubtably the pervasive expansion of technology we know today extends from the ideology of progress Coleridge contested. His still-relevant concern over the destabilization of privacy and the furious public dissemination of information (either as publicity or "knowledge") originates in the simple relation of type to paper. Nonetheless, it is precisely because the opposition of "literature" to "technology" denies its inescapable reliance on mechanisms of circulation that Coleridge's position (and our own) become so

complex; as my study of the Biographia suggests, we require a model of the relationship between technology, social construction, and ideology.

It is ironic, for instance, that print culture produced public and private modes of information that rival one another for authority and transform the definition of knowledge and know-er. The "publicity" that Coleridge's Biographia "exculpation" responds to, therefore, requires him to further extend his private life into public discourse. While the press provides the mechanism that violates Coleridge's privacy, however, Walter Ong contends that, in fact "print was...a major factor in the development of the sense of personal privacy that marks modern society" (Orality and Literacy 130). Ong theorizes that the portability of printed texts (replacing manuscripts) set "the stage psychologically for solo reading in a quiet corner" as the privileged activity of private ownership (130). The commercial print technology that facilitated this produced what Kernan describes as the "flood of books" in the eighteenth century that reduced valued classics into "commonplace objects" (Printing Technology 153). Coleridge indignantly claims that the uncontrolled multiplication of private readers and texts impaired the relationship between audience and books, compromised the quality of information, and critically empowered an unqualified public (BL I: 57). This unease with an epidemic of information and its manipulation by an unknown public prefigures our post-

modern condition; the Romantics recognized, as we do, an advancing economic-technological transformation but (aside from Blake) distanced themselves ideologically from their own dependence. Ong theorizes that:

> Both romanticism and modern technology appear at the same time because each grows in its own way out of a noetic abundance such as man had never known before. Technology uses the abundance for practical purposes. Romanticism uses it for assurance and as a springboard to another world. (Rhetoric 279)

Exemplifying this paradigm, Coleridge's theory of the imagination simultaneously synthesizes its panorama of German philosophy and justifies the cultivation of the mind and spirit. Conceptualizing literature as a "free and inspired activity motivated by its internal necessities alone" separates it from financial realities associated with both publication and circulation (Chartier 37); Coleridge's model of the "man of letters" as self-patron is designed precisely to maintain a reified "literature" distinct from commercial demands, thereby resisting what Kernan describes as a social shift "from an orientation to the past to a belief in progress" (Imaginary Library 26).

Coleridge is particularly significant today as we interrogate the structures defining our "canon" at a moment when the value of the study of "literature" is again questioned by society. While this attitude seems to derive directly from

the combination of capitalism and information technology, critics vary in assessing the implications. Kernan, for instance, concluding that the conception of "literature [extending from the Romantic period to the present] increasingly appears less and less a fact of nature and more and more a single episode in a much longer history of letters in western society" (Printing Technology 283), is optimistic that "the activity of making letters...is ceaseless" (286). Ong, however, claims that "the media...restructure the personality" (Rhetoric 334) and writes of the "crisis in the humanities."

At a time when we are realizing that, as D.F. McKenzie points out, "print is only a phase in the history of textual transmission" (52), Coleridge models the necessity of the conjunction between critical thought and critical engagement in social discourse.

Notes

[1] Raymond Williams defines "ideology" as: first, the pejorative notion of a manipulative "false consciousness," or secondly, "the set of ideas which arise from a given set of material interests or, more broadly, from a definite class or group" (156). All occurrences in this thesis (including citations) refer to the second definition.

[2] With the exception of the article by G.F. Mathew concerning Christabel in the European Magazine, November, 1816, all of the periodical reviews cited are unsigned but have been attributed to the writers indicated. For details, consult J. R. de J. Jackson, ed., Coleridge: The Critical Heritage, (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1970).

			Page
Remorse			
Thomas Barnes	31 January 1813	Examiner	122
Christabel			
William Hazlitt	2 June 1816	Examiner	205
The Statesman's Manual			
William Hazlitt	8 September 1816	Examiner	248
William Hazlitt	29 December 1816	Examiner	253
William Hazlitt	December 1816	Edinburgh Rev.	262
H. Crabb Robinson	January 1817	Critical Rev.	278
Biographia Literaria			
William Hazlitt	August 1817	Edinburgh Rev.	295
"Christopher North"	October 1817	Blackwood's	325

Works Cited

Rev. of A Lay-Sermon on the Distresses of the Country, addressed to the Middle and Higher Orders, by S.T. Coleridge. Examiner 8 September 1816: 571-3.

Baker, Herschel. William Hazlitt. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1962.

Bate, Jonathan. Introduction. Elia & the Last Essays of Elia. By Charles Lamb. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1987. ix-xxii.

Bate, Walter Jackson. "Nether Stowey." Coleridge. New York: MacMillan, 1968. 22-35.

Rev. of Biographia Literaria, by S.T. Coleridge. British Critic 8 (November 1817): 460-81.

Rev. of Biographia Literaria; or Biographical Sketches of My Literary Life and Opinions, by S.T. Coleridge. Edinburgh Review 28 (August 1817): 488-515.

Butler, Marilyn. "The Rise of the Man of Letters: Coleridge." Romantics, Rebels and Reactionaries: English Literature and its Background 1760-1830. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1981. 69-93.

---. "Culture's medium: the role of the review." The Cambridge Companion to British Romanticism. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993. 120-47.

Chartier, Roger. L'ordre des livres. 1992. Rpt. as The Order of Books: Readers, Authors, and Libraries in Europe between the Fourteenth and Eighteenth Centuries. Trans. Lydia G. Cochrane. Oxford: Polity Press, 1994.

Christensen, Jerome. Practicing Enlightenment: Hume and the Formation of a Literary Career. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1987.

---. "The Literary Life of a Man of Letters." Coleridge's Blessed Machine of Language. London: Cornell UP, 1981. 118-185.

Coleridge, Samuel Taylor. Biographia Literaria or Biographical Sketches of My Literary Life and Opinions. Eds. James Engell and W. Jackson Bate. Vol. 1 and 2. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1983. 2 Vols., No. 7 of The Collected Works of Samuel Taylor Coleridge. 16 Nos. Gen. Ed. Kathleen Coburn, Assoc. Ed. Bart Winer.

---. Lay Sermons. Ed. R.J. White. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1972. No. 6 of The Collected Works of Samuel Taylor Coleridge. 16 Nos. Gen. Ed. Kathleen Coburn, Assoc. Ed. Bart Winer.

Colmer, John. Coleridge: Critic of Society. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1959.

De Quincey, Thomas. Confessions of an English Opium Eater. Confessions of an English Opium Eater and Other Writings. Ed. Grevel Lindop. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1985. 1-79.

---. Suspiria de Profundis. Confessions of an English Opium Eater and Other Writings. Ed. Grevel Lindop. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1985. 87-181.

Doughty, Oswald. Perturbed Spirit: The Life and Personality of Samuel Taylor Coleridge. New Jersey: Associated University Presses, 1981.

Engell, James and W. Jackson Bate. Introduction. Biographia Literaria or Biographical Sketches of My Literary Life and Opinions. by S.T. Coleridge. Vol. 1. London: Princeton UP, 1983. xli-cxxxvi. 2 Vols., No. 7 of The Collected Works of Samuel Taylor Coleridge. 16 Nos. Gen. Ed. Kathleen Coburn, Assoc. Ed. Bart Winer.

Gross, John. Foreword. The Rise and Fall of the Man of Letters: Aspects of English Literary Life Since 1800. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1969.

Hauser, Arnold. The Social History of Art. Vol. 3. Trans. Stanley Godman. New York: Vintage, 1957.

Habermas, Jürgen. Strukturwandel der Öffentlichkeit. 1962. rpt. as The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society. Trans. Thomas Burger and Frederick Lawrence. Massachusetts: MIT Press, 1991.

Hazlitt, William. Liber Amoris. The Complete Works of William Hazlitt, Centenary Edition. Ed. P. P. Howe. Vol. 9. London: J. M. Dent and Sons, 1932. 95-162. 21 Vols.

Jackson, J. R. de J., Ed. Coleridge: The Critical Heritage. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1970.

---. "Some Biographical Circumstances." Method and Imagination in Coleridge's Criticism. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1969.

Kernan, Alvin. Printing Technology, Letters & Samuel Johnson. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1987. .

---. The Imaginary Library: An Essay on Literature and Society. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1982.

Klancher, Jon P. The Making of English Reading Audiences, 1790-1832. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1987.

---. Introduction. "Romanticism and its Publics: A Forum." Studies in Romanticism 33:4 (Winter 1994): 523-5.

Lamb, Charles. Elia & the Last Essays of Elia. Ed. Jonathan Bate. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1987.

---. Confessions of a Drunkard. Elia & the Last Essays of Elia. Ed. Jonathan Bate. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1987. 313-20.

McFarland, Thomas. Romanticism and the Forms of Ruin. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1981.

McKenzie, D. F. The Panizzi Lectures 1985: Bibliography and the sociology of texts. London: The British Library, 1986.

McKeon, Michael. "Writer as Hero: Novelistic Prefigurations and the Emergence of Literary Biography." Contesting the Subject: Essays in the Postmodern Theory and Practice of Biography and Biographical Cricitism. Ed. William H. Epstein. West Lafayette, Indiana: Purdue UP, 1991. 17-41.

Morrow, John. Coleridge's Political Thought: Property, Morality and the Limits of Traditional Discourse. London: MacMillan, 1990.

Ong, Walter J. Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word. London: Methuen, 1982.

---. Rhetoric, Romance, and Technology: Studies in the Interaction of Expression and Culture. London: Cornell UP, 1971.

Parrinder, Patrick. Authors and Authority: English and American Criticism 1750-1990. London: MacMillan, 1991.

Pyle, Forest. "Coleridge: The Institution of Imagination." The Ideology of Imagination: Subject and Society in the Discourse of Romanticism. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1995. 27-57.

Roper, Derek. "The Reviews." Reviewing before the Edinburgh 1788-1802. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1978. 19-48.

Rev. of The Statesman's Manual, by S.T. Coleridge. Critical Review 5 (January 1817): 42-8.

Rev. of The Statesman's Manual, by S.T. Coleridge. Edinburgh Review 27 (December 1816): 444-59.

Rev. of The Statesman's Manual, by S.T. Coleridge. Examiner 29 December 1816: 824-7.

Wheeler, Kathleen M. "The `Biographia', Past and Present." Sources, processes and methods in Coleridge's Biographia Literaria. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1980. 160-162.

White, R. J. Editor's Introduction. The Collected Works of Samuel Taylor Coleridge: Lay Sermons. By S. T. Coleridge. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1972. No. 6 of The Collected Works of Samuel Taylor Coleridge. 16 Nos. Gen. Ed. Kathleen Coburn, Assoc. Ed. Bart Winer.

Williams, Raymond. "Ideology." Keywords: A vocabulary of culture and society. London: Fontana Press, 1976. 153-57.

Wordsworth, William. "Essay Supplementary to the Preface, 1815." Prose Works of William Wordsworth. Ed. William Knight. Vol. 2. London: MacMillan, 1896. 3 Vols. 225-55.

---. "Preface to the Edition of 1815." Prose Works of William Wordsworth. Ed. William Knight. Vol. 2. London: MacMillan, 1896. 3 Vols. 202-221.

---. "Preface to the Lyrical Ballads (1800)." The Prose Works of William Wordsworth. Eds. W. J. B. Owen and Jane Worthington Smyser. Vol. 1. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1974. 119-58.